

No. 00-1899

\*\*\*\*\*

[UNPUBLISHED]

Appellees.

\*  
\*

---

Submitted: August 25, 2000

Filed: September 11, 2000

---

Before McMILLIAN, BOWMAN, and MORRIS SHEPPARD ARNOLD, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Oscar Guthrie, an Arkansas inmate, appeals from the final judgment entered in the District Court<sup>1</sup> for the Eastern District of Arkansas dismissing this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). For reversal appellant argues that the district court erred in concluding that enforcement of a prison grooming regulation does not violate his constitutional rights. For the reasons discussed below, we affirm the judgment of the district court.

This court has repeatedly upheld similar challenges to prison grooming regulations, see Campbell v. Purkett, 957 F.2d 535, 536-37 (8th Cir. 1992); Dunavant v. Moore, 907 F.2d 77, 79 (8th Cir. 1990), and Guthrie's complaint did not allege any facts that would distinguish this case from the line of cases upholding hair and beard restrictions, see Iron Eyes v. Henry, 907 F.2d 810, 814 (8th Cir. 1990) (preventing prisoners from concealing contraband and alleviating confusion in prisoner

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable William R. Wilson, Jr., United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, adopting the report and recommendations of the Honorable H. David Young, United States Magistrate Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

identification are valid penological interests justifying prison hair-length policy, although contraband had never been found in any inmate's hair, and identification fears were hard to credit in light of prison's lax approach to photographing inmates). Therefore, the district court correctly dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim.

Accordingly, we affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47B. Guthrie's "Motion for Issuing a Restriction Order" is denied.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLE RK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.